

REMARKS

Claims 33-80 are pending in the application. No claim amendments are made with this reply.

I. Double Patenting

The Office rejected various combinations of the pending claims, although not all pending claims, under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,616,749, claim 40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,537,363, claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,402,826, and claims 1-14, 19, 20-21, 23, and 24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,610,137. Office Action at pages 2-4.

While Applicants disagree with the merits of the each of these respective rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants have filed concurrently herewith a Terminal Disclaimer over claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,616,749, claim 40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,537,363, claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,402,826, and claims 1-14, 19, 20-21, 23, and 24 of U.S. Patent No. 6,610,137. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these grounds for rejection should be withdrawn as moot.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: June 8, 2004

By: Michele C. Bosch
Michele C. Bosch
Reg. No. 40,524